arXiv:1408.1242v1 [math.FA] 6 Aug 2014

UNIFYING ORDER STRUCTURES FOR COLOMBEAU ALGEBRAS

PAOLO GIORDANO AND EDUARD A. NIGSCH

Abstract. We define a general notion of *set of indices* which, using concepts from pre-ordered sets theory, permits to unify the presentation of several Colombeau-type algebras of nonlinear generalized functions. In every set of indices it is possible to generalize Landau's notion of big-O such that its usual properties continue to hold. Using this generalized notion of big-O, these algebras can be formally defined the same way as the special Colombeau algebra. Finally, we examine the scope of this formalism and show its effectiveness by applying it to the proof of the pointwise characterization in Colombeau algebras.

1. Introduction

Colombeau algebras are algebras of generalized functions introduced by J.-F. Colombeau in order to rigorously define multiplication and other nonlinear operations on Schwartz distributions in a consistent way. Containing the space of Schwartz distributions as a linear subspace and the algebra of smooth functions as a faithful subalgebra, they permit to bypass the Schwartz impossibility result. We refer to [3, 4, 5, 8, 10] for detailed information; our terminology and notation mainly follows [8]. Besides Colombeau's original algebra, the full algebra $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}$ and the special algebra $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$ on open subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ appeared ([3, 4, 5]) and some years later the diffeomorphism invariant local algebra $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ ([8]) was constructed.

A parallel thread, using nonstandard Analysis (NSA) methods, arrived at a similar algebra $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, (called *algebra of asymptotic functions*, see e.g. [11] and references therein) that has better formal properties: the scalars of the algebra form an algebraically closed Cantor complete field, it is defined using a reduced number of quantifiers, and for it a Hahn-Banach extension principle holds ([11]).

Because there are many variants of Colombeau algebras in use today, it is desirable to gain a better understanding of their common structure as well as their distinguishing properties. In the present work, we will examine in which way suitable notions from the theory of pre-ordered sets permit to unify the formal presentation

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46F30.
Key words and phrases. Colombeau algebra, set of indices, Landau big-O .
P. Giordano has been supported by grant P25116-N25 of the Austrian Science Fund FWF..
E. Nigsch has been supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) projects P23714 and P25064.

of some of these algebras. In particular, we will introduce the notion of *set of indices*, which allows for a generalization of Landau's asymptotic relations preserving their formal properties. Using these new generalized asymptotic relations, we will reformulate the definitions of the algebras $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$, $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$, $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ mentioned above using the same reduced number of quantifiers of the special one.

We start by introducing new notations for the mollifier operator S_ε and for the translation operator T_x (cf. [8, Section 2.3.2]) in order to emphasize that they are group actions on the space $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of test functions on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We include zero in the natural numbers $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$.

Definition 1. For $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we define

(i) $r \odot \varphi : y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto S_r\varphi(y) := \frac{1}{r^n} \cdot \varphi\left(\frac{y}{r}\right) \in \mathbb{R}$,
(ii) $x \oplus \varphi : y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto T_x\varphi(y) := \varphi(y - x) \in \mathbb{R}$.

It is easy to prove that $\odot$ is an action of the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{R}_{>0}, \cdot, 1)$ on $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\oplus$ is an action of the additive group $(\mathbb{R}^n, +, 0)$ on $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Moreover, $r \odot (x \oplus \varphi) = rx \oplus r \odot \varphi$ for $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. The following lemma will be used later.

Lemma 2. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n) \setminus \{0\}$, $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then the actions $\odot$ and $\oplus$ are free, i.e.:*

(i) $r \odot \varphi = \varphi$ *if and only if* $r = 1$
(ii) $x \oplus \varphi = \varphi$ *if and only if* $x = 0$

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$: The equality $r \odot \varphi = \varphi$ means $\frac{1}{r^n}\varphi\left(\frac{x}{r}\right) = \varphi(x)$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which directly implies

$$\frac{1}{r} \cdot \operatorname{supp}(\varphi) = \operatorname{supp}(\varphi). \tag{1.1}$$

The support set $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi)$ is closed, bounded and non empty because $\varphi \neq 0$. Take $x \in \operatorname{supp}(\varphi)$ such that $|x|$ is maximum, from (1.1) we get $\frac{x}{r} \in \operatorname{supp}(\varphi)$ and hence

$$\left|\frac{x}{r}\right| = \frac{1}{r}|x| \leq |x|. \tag{1.2}$$

$|x| = 0$ would imply $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi) = \{0\}$, which is impossible since φ is continuous. Therefore, (1.2) implies $\frac{1}{r} \leq 1$. But $r \odot \varphi = \varphi$ implies $\varphi = \frac{1}{r} \odot \varphi$, hence, with the same reasoning, we also get $r \leq 1$, from which the conclusion follows.
(ii) $\Rightarrow$: The equality $x \oplus \varphi = \varphi$ means $\varphi(\cdot - x) = \varphi(\cdot)$ and hence

$$\operatorname{supp}(\varphi) - x = \operatorname{supp}(\varphi). \tag{1.3}$$

There exists $y_0 \in \operatorname{supp}(\varphi)$, and $L := \{y_0 - tx \mid t \geq 0\}$ is closed, so $K := L \cap \operatorname{supp}(\varphi)$ is compact. Therefore, there exists a point $y \in K$ where the distance $|y - y_0|$ is maximum. We can write $y = y_0 - tx$ for some $t \geq 0$ because $y \in L$. By (1.3) we

also get $y - x \in \operatorname{supp}(\varphi)$. But $y - x = y_0 - (t+1)x \in L$, so $y - x \in K$ and thus $|y - y_0| \geq |y - x - y_0|$, i.e. $t|x| \geq (t+1)|x|$, which implies $|x| = 0$. □

2. Set of indices

The formulation of Colombeau algebras always involves asymptotic estimates. The basic idea of the following definitions is to clarify and abstract these asymptotics and thus to unify the notations and the logical structure of Colombeau algebras.

Definition 3. We say that $\mathbb{I} = (I, \leq, \mathcal{I})$ is a *set of indices* if the following conditions hold:

(i) $(I, \leq)$ is a pre-ordered set, i.e., I is a non empty set with a reflexive and transitive relation $\leq$.

(ii) $\mathcal{I}$ is a set of subsets of I such that $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{I}$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}$.

(iii) $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{I}\, \exists C \in \mathcal{I} :\ C \subseteq A \cap B$.

For all $e \in I$, set $(\emptyset, e] := \{\varepsilon \in I \mid \varepsilon \leq e\}$. As usual, we say $\varepsilon < e$ if $\varepsilon \leq e$ and $\varepsilon \neq e$. Using these notations, we state the last condition in the definition of set of indices:

(iv) If $e \leq a \in A \in \mathcal{I}$, the set $A_{\leq e} := (\emptyset, e] \cap A$ is downward directed by $<$, i.e., it is non empty and

$$\forall b, c \in A_{\leq e}\, \exists d \in A_{\leq e} :\ d < b\ ,\ d < c. \tag{2.1}$$

Remark 4.

(i) Conditions (ii) and (iii) can be summarized saying that $\mathcal{I}$ is a filter base on I which contains I.

(ii) Let us note explicitly that in (iv) it is not required that $e \in A$. In Thm. 10 (x) we will motivate this choice.

(iii) Since $I \in \mathcal{I}$, condition (iv) yields that $(\emptyset, e]$ is downward directed by $<$ for each $e \in I$.

(iv) In the set of indices that we will define for the full algebra $\mathcal{G}^e(\Omega)$ (see Def. 18 below), we will see that in general $(\emptyset, e]$ is not an element of $\mathcal{I}$. In the same example, we have that in general $A \in \mathcal{I}$ is not downward directed.

In order to illustrate this definition we will give some examples.

Example 5.

(i) The simplest example of set of indices is given by $I^s := (0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, the relation $\leq$ is the usual order relation on $\mathbb{R}$, and $\mathcal{I}^s := \{(0, \varepsilon_0] \mid \varepsilon_0 \in I\}$. We denote by $\mathbb{I}^s := (I^s, \leq, \mathcal{I}^s)$ this set of indices which, as we will see, is the one used for the special algebra $\mathcal{G}^s$.

(ii) Let $\mathcal{I}$ be an ultrafilter on $\mathbb{N}$ containing the Fréchet filter ([7]). Let $\geq$ be the usual order relation on the natural numbers. Then $(\mathbb{N}, \geq, \mathcal{I})$ is a set of indices which can also be used for the formulation of the special algebra.

(iii) In the context of [11], we set $\hat{I} := \mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The pre-order relation is defined by $\varphi \leq \psi$ iff $\underline{\varphi} \leq \underline{\psi}$, where $\underline{\varphi} := \operatorname{diam}(\operatorname{supp}(\varphi))$ (the diameter of the support of φ) if $\varphi \neq 0$ and $\underline{\varphi} := 1$ otherwise. Note that this is only a pre-order and not an order relation. $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ is the free ultrafilter on $\mathcal{D}_0$ employed in [11], and we set $\hat{\mathbb{I}} := (\hat{I}, \leq, \hat{\mathcal{I}})$. In the following Thm. 6 it is proved that this is actually a set of indices.

Theorem 6. *$\hat{\mathbb{I}}$ is a set of indices.*

Proof. Properties (i), (ii) and (iii) are clear. Def. 2.1 and Thm. 2.3 in [11] imply that we have a sequence $(\mathcal{D}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ such that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}\, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{D}_n :\ \underline{\varphi} \leq \frac{1}{n}. \tag{2.2}$$

So, if $e \leq a \in A \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\varphi, \psi \in A_{\leq e}$, then $0 < \underline{\varphi} \leq \underline{e}$ and $0 < \underline{\psi} \leq \underline{e}$. Therefore there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$ such that $\frac{1}{n} < \min\left(\underline{\varphi}, \underline{\psi}\right) \leq \underline{e}$. Since $\mathcal{D}_n \in \mathcal{I}$, also $\mathcal{D}_n \cap A \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}$ from (iii) of Def. 3. But $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ is an ultrafilter, so there exists $d \in \mathcal{D}_n \cap A$. Applying (2.2) with $\varphi = d$ we obtain $\underline{d} \leq \frac{1}{n} < \min\left(\underline{\varphi}, \underline{\psi}\right) \leq \underline{e}$ which is the conclusion. □

2.1. **Two notions of big-O in a set of indices.** In each set of indices, we can define two notions of big-O that formally behave in the usual way.

Since each set of the form $A_{\leq a} = (\emptyset, a] \cap A$ is downward directed, the first big-O is the usual one:

Definition 7. Let $\mathbb{I} = (I, \leq, \mathcal{I})$ be a set of indices. Let $a \in A \in \mathcal{I}$ and (x_ε), $(y_\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^I$ be two nets of real numbers defined in I. We write

$$x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon) \text{ as } \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I} \tag{2.3}$$

if

$$\exists H \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\, \exists \varepsilon_0 \in A_{\leq a}\, \forall \varepsilon \in A_{\leq \varepsilon_0} :\ |x_\varepsilon| \leq H \cdot |y_\varepsilon|. \tag{2.4}$$

We explicitly note that the variable ε in (2.3) is actually a mute variable. As usual (see e.g. [2]), the notation $x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)$ really represents a pre-order relation, and the use of the equality sign is an abuse of language. From this point of view, a Vinogradov notation like $x_\varepsilon \ll_{a,A} y_\varepsilon$ would surely be better. Another innocuous abuse of language is the use of the symbol $\leq$ for the pre-order relation on I and for the order relation on the reals used in the last part of (2.4).

Example 8.

(i) In the set of indices $\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{s}}$ of the special algebra (see (i) of Ex. 5), the following are equivalent:

(a) $\forall A \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{s}}\, \forall a \in A :\ x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{s}}$ (or any other combination of quantifiers $\exists A\, \exists a$, $\forall A\, \exists a$, $\exists A\, \forall a$)

(b) $x_\varepsilon = O(y_\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$

(ii) In the set of indices $\hat{\mathbb{I}}$ of the algebra of asymptotic functions $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ ((iii) of Ex. 5), the following are equivalent:

(a) $\exists A \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}\, \forall a \in A :\ x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \in \hat{\mathbb{I}}$

(b) $\exists H \in \mathbb{R}_{\neq 0} :\ |x_\varphi| \leq H \cdot |y_\varphi|$ almost everywhere, where a property $\mathcal{P}(\varphi)$ is said to hold *almost everywhere* iff $\{\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_0 \mid \mathcal{P}(\varphi)\} \in \mathcal{I}$ (see [11]).

To prove this equivalence, we need the following

Lemma 9. *In the set of indices $\hat{\mathbb{I}}$, we have $(\emptyset, \varepsilon_o] \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}$ for all $\varepsilon_0 \in \hat{I}$.*

Proof. Since $\underline{\varepsilon_0} > 0$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\neq 0}$ sufficiently big we have $\frac{1}{n} \leq \underline{\varepsilon_0}$. From (2.2) we thus have $\underline{\varphi} \leq \frac{1}{n} \leq \underline{\varepsilon_0}$ for each $\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_n$. Therefore $\mathcal{D}_n \subseteq (\emptyset, \varepsilon_0]$. But $\mathcal{D}_n \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ is an ultrafilter, so also $(\emptyset, \varepsilon_0] \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}$. □

Now, we prove that the previous (ii)a and (ii)b are equivalent.

(ii)a ⇒ (ii)b: Property (ii)a yields

$$\forall a \in A\, \exists H \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\, \exists \varepsilon_0 \in A_{\leq a}\, \forall \varepsilon \in A_{\leq \varepsilon_0} :\ |x_\varepsilon| \leq H \cdot |y_\varepsilon|. \tag{2.5}$$

But there always exists $a \in A$ because A is an ultrafilter set, so $|x_\varepsilon| \leq H \cdot |y_\varepsilon|$ for all $\varepsilon \in A_{\leq \varepsilon_0}$. Lem. 9 yields $(\emptyset, \varepsilon_0] \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}$ and hence $A_{\leq \varepsilon_0} = (\emptyset, \varepsilon_0] \cap A \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}$. Hence, we can say that

$$\left\{\varepsilon \in \hat{I} \mid |x_\varepsilon| \leq H \cdot |y_\varepsilon|\right\} \supseteq A_{\leq \varepsilon_0} \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}.$$

The conclusion follows because $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$ is an ultrafilter.

(ii)b ⇒ (ii)a: Property (ii)b means $A := \left\{\varepsilon \in \hat{I} \mid |x_\varepsilon| \leq H \cdot |y_\varepsilon|\right\} \in \hat{\mathcal{I}}$. For each $a \in A$ we set $\varepsilon_0 := a$ so that (2.5) follows by definition of A.

Theorem 10. *Let $\mathbb{I} = (I, \leq, \mathcal{I})$ be a set of indices, $e \in A \in \mathcal{I}$ and (x_ε), (y_ε), $(z_\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^I$, then, as $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$, the following properties of $O_{a,A}$ hold:*

(i) $x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon)$

(ii) $x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)$ *and* $y_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(z_\varepsilon)$, *then* $x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(z_\varepsilon)$

(iii) $O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon) \cdot O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon) = O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon \cdot y_\varepsilon)$

(iv) $O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon) + O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon) = O_{a,A}\left(|x_\varepsilon| + |y_\varepsilon|\right)$

(v) $x_\varepsilon \cdot O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon) = O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon \cdot y_\varepsilon)$

(vi) $O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon) + O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon) = O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon)$

(vii) *If* $x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon \geq 0$ *for all* $\varepsilon \in I$, *then* $x_\varepsilon + O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon) = O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon + y_\varepsilon)$

(viii) $\forall k \in \mathbb{R} :\ O_{a,A}(k \cdot x_\varepsilon) = O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon)$

(ix) $\forall k \in \mathbb{R} :\ k \cdot O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon) = O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon)$

(x) *If* $x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)$ *and* $a \in B \subseteq A$, *where* $B \in \mathcal{I}$, *then* $x_\varepsilon = O_{a,B}(y_\varepsilon)$

Proof. All properties (i) - (ix) have a similar schema of proof. Therefore, we give as example the proof of (iii). As it is customary, this has to be read as

$$x'_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon)\ ,\ y'_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)\ \Rightarrow\ x'_\varepsilon \cdot y'_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon \cdot y_\varepsilon).$$

The assumptions of this implication yield the existence of H, K, ε_0, ε_1 such that

$$H > 0\ ,\ \varepsilon_0 \in A_{\leq a}\ ,\ \forall \varepsilon \in A_{\leq \varepsilon_0} :\ |x'_\varepsilon| \leq H \cdot |x_\varepsilon| \tag{2.6}$$

$$K > 0\ ,\ \varepsilon_1 \in A_{\leq a}\ ,\ \forall \varepsilon \in A_{\leq \varepsilon_1} :\ |y'_\varepsilon| \leq K \cdot |y_\varepsilon|. \tag{2.7}$$

Thus, there exists $\varepsilon_2 \in A_{\leq a}$ such that $\varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1$, and for each $\varepsilon \in A_{\leq \varepsilon_2}$, (2.6) and (2.7) imply the conclusion $|x'_\varepsilon \cdot y'_\varepsilon| \leq H \cdot K \cdot |x_\varepsilon \cdot y_\varepsilon|$.

In proving (x), we need to use a peculiar part of Def. 3 (iv). Assume that (2.4) holds and $a \in B \subseteq A$, with $B \in \mathcal{I}$. Then we have $\varepsilon_0 \leq a \in B \in \mathcal{I}$ (note that not necessarily $\varepsilon_0 \in B$). By Def. 3 (iv) the set $B_{\leq \varepsilon_0}$ is directed, so it is non empty. Let $\varepsilon_1 \in B_{\leq \varepsilon_0}$. Then for each $\varepsilon \in B_{\leq \varepsilon_1}$ we have $\varepsilon \in A_{\leq \varepsilon_0}$ and the conclusion follows. □

Frequently, claims involving Landau big-O asymptotic relations $x_\varepsilon = O(y_\varepsilon)$ are proved by contradiction. A method frequently used in this type of proofs concerns the existence of a decreasing sequence $(\varepsilon_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ which tends to zero and along which the net (x_ε) is not bounded by (y_ε). We want to show that this method holds with great generality in every set of indices. We start by defining in general what the sentence "a sequence tends to the empty set in the directed set $A_{\leq a}$" means:

Definition 11. Let $\mathbb{I} = (I, \leq, \mathcal{I})$ be a set of indices. Let $a \in A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $A_{\leq a}$. Then we say that

$$(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset \text{ in } A_{\leq a}$$

if

$$\forall \varepsilon_0 \in A_{\leq a}\, \exists K \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq K} :\ z_k < \varepsilon_0. \tag{2.8}$$

Example 12.

(i) In the set of indices $\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{s}}$, we have that $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset$ in $A_{\leq a}$ if and only if $\lim_{k\to+\infty} z_k = 0^+$.

(ii) In the set of indices $\hat{\mathbb{I}}$, we have that $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset$ in $A_{\leq a}$ if and only if $\lim_{k\to+\infty} \underline{z_k} = 0^+$. In fact, if $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, take $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\neq 0}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n} < \min(\underline{a}, r). \tag{2.9}$$

But $\mathcal{D}_n \cap A$ is non empty because it is an ultrafilter set in $\hat{\mathcal{I}}$. Thus, there exists $\varepsilon_0 \in \mathcal{D}_n \cap A$ and $\varepsilon_0 \leq a$ from (2.9). From (2.8) we get $z_k < \varepsilon_0$ for k sufficiently big, and thus $\underline{z_k} \leq \underline{\varepsilon_0} < r$. This proves that necessarily $\left(\underline{z_k}\right)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to 0^+$. Vice

versa, if $\lim_{k\to+\infty} z_k = 0^+$, then for k sufficiently big we have $\underline{z_k} < \underline{\varepsilon_0}$, i.e. $z_k < \varepsilon_0$.

Lemma 13. *In the hypothesis of Def. 11, assume that $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset$ in $A_{\leq a}$ and that*

$$\forall b, c \in A_{\leq a} : \ b < c \text{ or } c \leq b. \tag{2.10}$$

Then there exists a strictly decreasing subsequence $(z_{\sigma_k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $A_{\leq a}$ which tends to $\emptyset$ in $A_{\leq a}$.

Proof. Taking $\varepsilon_0 = z_0$ in (2.8) we get the existence of $\sigma_0 := \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid z_k < z_0\}$, and $z_{\sigma_0} < z_0$. If $k < \sigma_0$, $z_k < z_{\sigma_0}$ cannot hold and hence $z_{\sigma_0} \leq z_k$ by (2.10). Setting $\varepsilon_0 = z_{\sigma_0}$ in (2.8) we obtain the existence of $\sigma_1 := \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid z_k < z_{\sigma_0}\}$. As before, $z_{\sigma_1} < z_{\sigma_0}$, $\sigma_1 > \sigma_0$ and $z_{\sigma_1} \leq z_k$ if $k < \sigma_1$. Continuing in this way we can define a strictly increasing sequence $(\sigma_k)_k$ such that $(z_{\sigma_k})_k$ is strictly decreasing. Moreover, $z_{\sigma_n} \leq z_k$ whenever $\sigma_n > k$. This subsequence tends to $\emptyset$ because if $\varepsilon_0 \in A_{\leq a}$ and $z_K < \varepsilon_0$, then for n sufficiently big $\sigma_n > K$ and hence $z_{\sigma_n} \leq z_K < \varepsilon_0$. □

Theorem 14. *Let $\mathbb{I} = (I, \leq, \mathcal{I})$ be a set of indices. Let $a \in A \in \mathcal{I}$ and (x_ε), $(y_\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^I$ be two nets of real numbers defined in I. Assume also that $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of $A_{\leq a}$ such that $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset$ in $A_{\leq a}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(i) $\neg\,[x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)$ *as* $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}]$

(ii) *For each $H \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ there exists a sequence $(\varepsilon_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $A_{\leq a}$ such that:*

- *(a)* $(\varepsilon_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset$ *in* $A_{\leq a}$
- *(b)* $\forall k \in \mathbb{N} : \ |x_{\varepsilon_k}| > H \cdot |y_{\varepsilon_k}|$

Proof. (i) ⇒ (ii): We assume that

$$\forall H \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\, \forall \bar{\varepsilon}_0 \in A_{\leq a}\, \exists \varepsilon \in A_{\leq \bar{\varepsilon}_0} : \ |x_\varepsilon| > H \cdot |y_\varepsilon|. \tag{2.11}$$

Consider an $H \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. The sequence $(\varepsilon_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is defined recursively and using the axiom of countable choice. The first step of the sequence is defined as follows. Since $z_0 \in A_{\leq a}$, we can set $\bar{\varepsilon}_0 = z_0$ in (2.11) to obtain the existence of $\varepsilon_0 \in A_{\leq z_0}$ such that $|x_{\varepsilon_0}| > H \cdot |y_{\varepsilon_0}|$. Assume that we have already proved the existence of $\varepsilon_k \in A_{\leq a}$ such that $\varepsilon_k \leq z_k$ and $|x_{\varepsilon_k}| > H \cdot |y_{\varepsilon_k}|$. We can now apply (2.11) with $\bar{\varepsilon}_0 = z_{k+1}$ to obtain the existence of $\varepsilon_{k+1} \in A_{\leq z_{k+1}}$ such that $\left|x_{\varepsilon_{k+1}}\right| > H \cdot \left|y_{\varepsilon_{k+1}}\right|$. Since $\varepsilon_k \leq z_k$ and $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset$ in $A_{\leq a}$, also $(\varepsilon_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset$ in $A_{\leq a}$.

(ii) ⇒ (i): By contradiction, assume that

$$\exists H \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\, \exists \bar{\varepsilon}_0 \in A_{\leq a}\, \forall \varepsilon \in A_{\leq \bar{\varepsilon}_0} : \ |x_\varepsilon| \leq H \cdot |y_\varepsilon|. \tag{2.12}$$

Since $(\varepsilon_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset$ in $A_{\leq a}$, for k sufficiently big we have $\varepsilon_k \leq \bar{\varepsilon}_0$ and so $|x_{\varepsilon_k}| \leq H \cdot |y_{\varepsilon_k}|$ by (2.12), which contradicts (ii)b. □

Condition (ii)a of Ex. 8 and the definition of the full algebra $\mathcal{G}^e$ (see Section 3) are the motivations for the following second notion of big-O in a set of indices:

Definition 15. Let $\mathbb{I} = (I, \leq, \mathcal{I})$ be a set of indices. Let $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be a non empty subset of $\mathcal{I}$ such that

$$\forall A, B \in \mathcal{J}\, \exists C \in \mathcal{J} :\ C \subseteq A \cap B. \tag{2.13}$$

Finally, let (x_ε), $(y_\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^I$ be nets of real numbers. Then we say

$$x_\varepsilon = O_{\mathcal{J}}(y_\varepsilon) \text{ as } \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$$

if

$$\exists A \in \mathcal{J}\, \forall a \in A :\ x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon).$$

We simply write $x_\varepsilon = O(y_\varepsilon)$ (as $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$) when $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}$, i.e. for $x_\varepsilon = O_{\mathcal{I}}(y_\varepsilon)$.

Intuitive interpretation. In this section, we want to give an intuitive interpretation of the structures we are introducing.

We can think of each $e \in I$ as a measuring instrument to evaluate our observables $(x_\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^I$. For example, we can think of a thermometer used to measure the temperature at some point. Each $A \in \mathcal{I}$ is a class of instruments ($A \subseteq I$) having at least a certain *accuracy*. The relation $e \leq \varepsilon$ is interpreted as "the measuring instrument e is spatially more accurate than ε", in the sense that every physical measuring instrument averages the measure of an observable in a neighbourhood of some spatial point. For the instrument e this neighbourhood is smaller than that of ε. Therefore, $x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)$ can be interpreted saying: "We are able to state that (x_ε) is bounded by (y_ε) if we use any instrument ε of class $A \in \mathcal{I}$, and whose accuracy is greater than that of a". Finally, $x_\varepsilon = O(y_\varepsilon)$ can be intuitively interpreted saying: "We can find an accuracy class $A \in \mathcal{I}$ such that for each instrument $a \in A$ of that class, we can state that $x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)$". Condition (iii) of Def. 3 states that from two accuracy classes $A, B \in \mathcal{I}$ we can always find an accuracy class $C \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $C \subseteq A \cap B$, i.e. whose instruments have accuracy greater or equal to that of both A and B. Condition (iv) of Def. 3 states that taking the instrument $e \leq a \in A \in \mathcal{I}$, we can always take instruments which are spatially more accurate than e and remaining in the same accuracy class A.

The simplification consequent to the use of the second notion of big-O is due to the following theorem, which states that also the second big-O formally behaves as expected:

Theorem 16. *Under the assumptions of Def. 15, the following properties of $O_{\mathcal{J}}$, as $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$, hold:*

(i) $x_\varepsilon = O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon)$

(ii) $x_\varepsilon = O_{\mathcal{J}}(y_\varepsilon)$ *and* $y_\varepsilon = O_{\mathcal{J}}(z_\varepsilon)$, *then* $x_\varepsilon = O_{\mathcal{J}}(z_\varepsilon)$
(iii) $O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon) \cdot O_{\mathcal{J}}(y_\varepsilon) = O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon \cdot y_\varepsilon)$
(iv) $O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon) + O_{\mathcal{J}}(y_\varepsilon) = O_{\mathcal{J}}\left(|x_\varepsilon| + |y_\varepsilon|\right)$
(v) $x_\varepsilon \cdot O_{\mathcal{J}}(y_\varepsilon) = O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon \cdot y_\varepsilon)$
(vi) $O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon) + O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon) = O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon)$
(vii) *If* $x_\varepsilon, y_\varepsilon \geq 0$ *for all* $\varepsilon \in I$, *then* $x_\varepsilon + O_{\mathcal{J}}(y_\varepsilon) = O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon + y_\varepsilon)$
(viii) $\forall k \in \mathbb{R}: \ O_{\mathcal{J}}(k \cdot x_\varepsilon) = O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon)$
(ix) $\forall k \in \mathbb{R}: \ k \cdot O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon) = O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon)$

Proof. (i): There exists $A \in \mathcal{J}$ since $\mathcal{J}$ is non empty by assumption. For all $a \in A$ the property $x_\varepsilon = O_{a,A}(x_\varepsilon)$ follows by (i) of Thm. 10.

(iii): Once again, we prove this property to illustrate the general idea of the proof of other properties like (ii), (iv) and (vi).

As usual, we have to prove that

$$x'_\varepsilon = O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon) \ , \ y'_\varepsilon = O_{\mathcal{J}}(y_\varepsilon) \ \Rightarrow \ x'_\varepsilon \cdot y'_\varepsilon = O_{\mathcal{J}}(x_\varepsilon \cdot y_\varepsilon).$$

Therefore, we assume

$$\exists A \in \mathcal{J} \, \forall c \in A: \ x'_\varepsilon = O_{c,A}(x_\varepsilon) \tag{2.14}$$

$$\exists B \in \mathcal{J} \, \forall c \in B: \ y'_\varepsilon = O_{c,B}(y_\varepsilon). \tag{2.15}$$

The assumptions on $\mathcal{J}$ yield the existence of $C \in \mathcal{J}$ such that $C \subseteq A$ and $C \subseteq B$. Property (x) of Thm. 10 and (2.14), (2.15) give $x'_\varepsilon = O_{c,C}(x_\varepsilon)$ and $y'_\varepsilon = O_{c,C}(y_\varepsilon)$ for all $c \in C$. We can thus apply the analogous property (iii) of Thm. 10 to get the conclusion

$$x'_\varepsilon \cdot y'_\varepsilon = O_{c,C}(x_\varepsilon \cdot y_\varepsilon) \qquad \forall c \in C.$$

For the remaining properties (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix) we don't even need to use the assumptions on $\mathcal{J}$. □

The following result is a direct consequence of Ex. 5, 8 and Def. 15. Its aim is not, of course, to simplify but to show the unifying capability of the notions of set of indices in connection with the results about $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ we will show in the subsequent sections.

Corollary 17. *Let* $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ *be an open set and* $(u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ *be a net of smooth functions. We use the notations of* [8] *for moderate and negligible nets related to the special algebra* $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{s}}(\Omega)$, *and the notations of* [11] *for similar notions related to the algebra* $\hat{\mathcal{G}}(\Omega)$ *of asymptotic functions. Then*

(i) $(u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{s}}_M(\Omega)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega \, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n \, \exists N \in \mathbb{N}: \ \sup_{x \in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O(\varepsilon^{-N}) \ \text{as} \ \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{s}}$$

(ii) $(u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{s}}(\Omega)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O(\varepsilon^m) \ \textit{as}\ \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{s}}$$

(iii) $(u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathcal{E}(\Omega)^{\mathcal{D}_0}\right)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O(\underline{\varepsilon}^{-N}) \ \textit{as}\ \varepsilon \in \hat{\mathbb{I}}$$

(iv) $(u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{N}\left(\mathcal{E}(\Omega)^{\mathcal{D}_0}\right)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O(\underline{\varepsilon}^{m}) \ \textit{as}\ \varepsilon \in \hat{\mathbb{I}}.$$

Henceforth, Ω will always denote an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

3. The full algebra $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}$

The idea to define the correct set of indices for the full algebra is that in the definition of $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}$ we always use representatives evaluated at $\varepsilon \odot \varphi$ and consider the asymptotics for $\varepsilon \to 0^+$ and fixed φ.

Definition 18. We define:

(i) $I^{\mathrm{e}} := \mathcal{A}_0 = \left\{\varphi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}^n) \mid \int \varphi = 1\right\}$

(ii) $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{e}} := \{\mathcal{A}_q \mid q \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $\mathcal{A}_q$ is the set of all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0$ such that $\int x^\alpha \cdot \varphi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with $1 \le |\alpha| \le q$.

(iii) For ε, $e \in I^{\mathrm{e}}$, we define $\varepsilon \le e$ iff there exist $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0$, r_ε, $r_e \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that
  (a) $r_\varepsilon \le r_e$
  (b) $\varepsilon = r_\varepsilon \odot \varphi$ and $e = r_e \odot \varphi$.
  Equivalently, we can define $\varepsilon \le e$ iff there exists $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $r \le 1$ and $\varepsilon = r \odot e$.

(iv) $\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}} := (I^{\mathrm{e}}, \le, \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{e}})$

We firstly note that if $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q$ then also $r \odot \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q$ for all $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and thus

$$e \in A \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{e}} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad (\emptyset, e] \subseteq A.$$

Therefore $A_{\le e} = (\emptyset, e]$ and so $O_{e,A}$ doesn't depend on A, and we can simply write $x_\varepsilon = O_e(y_\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}$.
Secondly, we note that, contrary to the case of $\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{s}}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{I}}$, in this case we don't have $(\emptyset, \varepsilon_0] \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{e}}$. Moreover, $A \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{e}}$ is not downward directed by $<$.

Theorem 19.

(i) $(I^{\mathrm{e}}, \le)$ *is an ordered set*

(ii) $(\emptyset, e]$ *is totally ordered and downward directed by* $<$ *for all* $e \in I^{\mathrm{e}}$

(iii) *Let $f,g\in\mathbb{R}^{I^{\mathrm{e}}}$ and $\varphi\in I^{\mathrm{e}}$. We use both the notation $f_\varepsilon=f(\varepsilon)$ for evaluating these maps. Then it results that*

$$f_\varepsilon=O_\varphi(g_\varepsilon)\ \text{ as } \varepsilon\in\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}$$

if and only if

$$f(r\odot\varphi)=O\left[g(r\odot\varphi)\right]\ \text{ as } r\to 0^+.$$

Proof. (i): Reflexivity follows from $1\odot\varepsilon=\varepsilon$. In order to prove transitivity, assume

$$\eta=s\odot\epsilon\ ,\ s\leq 1\ ,\ \varepsilon=r\odot e\ ,\ r\leq 1.$$

Then $\eta=s\odot(r\odot e)=sr\odot e$ and $sr\leq 1$, so that $\eta\leq e$. To prove antisymmetry, assume that

$$\varepsilon=r\odot e\ ,\ r\leq 1\ ,\ e=s\odot\varepsilon\ ,s\leq 1.$$

Then $\varepsilon=rs\odot\varepsilon$, which implies $rs=1$ by Lem. 2 and hence $r=s=1$.
(ii): Assume that $\varepsilon=r\odot e$, $r\leq 1$ and $\eta=s\odot e$, $s\leq 1$. Therefore $\varepsilon=\frac{r}{s}\odot\eta$ and we have $\varepsilon\leq\eta$ or $\eta\leq\varepsilon$ according to $\frac{r}{s}\leq 1$ or $\frac{s}{r}\leq 1$. Moreover, taking $t<\min(r,s)$ and $\sigma:=t\odot e\in(\emptyset,e]$ we get $\sigma<\varepsilon$ and $\sigma<\eta$.
(iii): Assume that $f_\varepsilon=O_\varphi(g_\varepsilon)$, i.e.

$$\exists H\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}\,\exists\varepsilon_0\leq\varphi\,\forall\varepsilon\leq\varepsilon_0:\ |f_\varepsilon|\leq H\cdot|g_\varepsilon|\,. \tag{3.1}$$

Hence, we can write $\varepsilon_0=r_0\odot\varphi$ for some $0<r_0\leq 1$, and for all $r\in(r,r_0]$ we get $\varepsilon:=r\odot\varphi\leq\varepsilon_0$. Thus, condition (3.1) implies

$$|f_\varepsilon|=|f\left(r\odot\varphi\right)|\leq H\cdot|g_\varepsilon|=H\cdot|g\left(r\odot\varphi\right)|\,,$$

which proves that $f(r\odot\varphi)=O\left[g(r\odot\varphi)\right]$ as $r\to 0^+$.

Vice versa, assume

$$\forall r\in(0,r_0]:\ |f\left(r\odot\varphi\right)|\leq H\cdot|g\left(r\odot\varphi\right)|\,, \tag{3.2}$$

where $H,r_0\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. We can assume that $r_0\leq 1$, so that setting $\varepsilon_0:=r_0\odot\varphi$ we have $\varepsilon_0\leq\varphi$. For each $\varepsilon\leq\varepsilon_0$, we can write $\varepsilon=r\odot\varepsilon_0=r\cdot r_0\odot\varphi$, with $r\leq 1$. Thus $r\cdot r_0\in(0,r_0]$ and (3.2) yields $|f\left(r\cdot r_0\odot\varphi\right)|=|f_\varepsilon|\leq H\cdot|g\left(r\cdot r_0\odot\varphi\right)|=H\cdot|g_\varepsilon|$, which is our conclusion. □

Corollary 20. *$\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}=(I^{\mathrm{e}},\leq,\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{e}})$ is a set of indices.*

The following natural result and the limit $\lim_{\varepsilon\leq e}\operatorname{int}\left[\operatorname{supp}(\varepsilon)\right]=\emptyset$ justify our notation $(\emptyset,e]$.

Corollary 21. *For all $e\in I^{\mathrm{e}}$, the map*

$$\begin{aligned}\omega:(0,1]&\to(\emptyset,e]\\ r&\mapsto r\odot e\end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism of ordered sets.

Proof. It is easy to prove that ω is order preserving and bijective. It remains to prove that ω^{-1} is order preserving. Assume $r \odot e \leq s \odot e$, with $r, s \in (0,1]$. Hence $r \odot e = ts \odot e$ for some positive $t \leq 1$. Therefore, $\frac{ts}{r} = 1$ and hence $r = ts \leq s$ as claimed. □

Corollary 22. *Let $e \in I^{\mathrm{e}}$ and $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $(\emptyset, e]$. Let (x_ε), $(y_\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}^{I^{\mathrm{e}}}$ be two nets of real numbers defined in I^{e}. Then*

(i) $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset$ *in* $(\emptyset, e]$ *if and only if* $\lim_{k\to+\infty} \underline{z_k} = 0^+$

(ii) *From $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ we can always extract a strictly decreasing subsequence which tends to $\emptyset$ in $(\emptyset, e]$*

(iii) *The asymptotic relation $x_\varepsilon = O_e(y_\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}$ is false if and only if for each $H \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ there exists a sequence $(\varepsilon_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $A_{\leq e}$ such that:*

(a) $(\varepsilon_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is strictly decreasing*

(b) $(\varepsilon_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \to \emptyset$ *in* $A_{\leq e}$

(c) $\forall k \in \mathbb{N} : \ |x_{\varepsilon_k}| > H \cdot |y_{\varepsilon_k}|$

Proof. Property (i) holds because we can write $z_k = r_k \odot e$ for a unique $r_k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and $(z_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ tends to $\emptyset$ if and only if $\lim_{k\to+\infty} r_k = 0^+$, i.e. if and only if $\lim_{k\to+\infty} \underline{z_k} = 0^+$.

From (ii) of Thm. 19, Lem. 13 and Thm. 14 we directly obtain the proof of (ii) and (iii). □

For the sake of completeness, we recall the usual notations for $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$:

Definition 23.

(i) $U(\Omega) := \{(\varphi, x) \in \mathcal{A}_0 \times \Omega \mid \mathrm{supp}(\varphi) \subseteq \Omega - x\}$;

(ii) We say that $R \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$ iff $R : U(\Omega) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0 : \ R(\varphi, -) \text{ is smooth on } \Omega \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathrm{supp}(\varphi) \subseteq \Omega - x\};$$

(iii) We say that $R \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{e}}_M(\Omega)$ iff $R \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$ and

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega \, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n \, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha R(\varepsilon \odot \varphi, x)| = O(\varepsilon^{-N});$$

(iv) We say that $R \in \mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$ iff $R \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$ and

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega \, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n \, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \, \exists q \in \mathbb{N} \, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha R(\varepsilon \odot \varphi, x)| = O(\varepsilon^{m});$$

(v) $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega) := \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{e}}_M(\Omega)/\mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$ is called the *full Colombeau algebra.*

We first give an equivalent characterization of $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$ as follows: For $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0$, set

$$\Omega_\varphi := \{x \in \Omega \mid \mathrm{supp}(\varphi) \subseteq \Omega - x\}.$$

Note that when $\Omega_\varphi = \emptyset$, the set $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_\varphi, \mathbb{R})$ has a single element. If X, Y and Z are sets and $f : X \times Y \longrightarrow Z$, $g : X \longrightarrow Z^Y$ are maps, we set

$$f^\wedge : x \in X \mapsto f(x, -) \in Z^Y$$
$$g^\vee : (x, y) \in X \times Y \mapsto g(x)(y) \in Z.$$

The maps $(-)^\wedge$ and $(-)^\vee$ can be used to express the property of Cartesian closedness of the category of sets (see e.g. [1]), i.e. $\left(Z^Y\right)^X \simeq Z^{X\times Y}$.

Since $R \in \mathcal{E}^e(\Omega)$ iff $R^\wedge : \mathcal{A}_0 \longrightarrow \bigcup_{\varphi\in\mathcal{A}_0} \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_\varphi, \mathbb{R})$ and $R(\varphi, -) \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_\varphi, \mathbb{R})$ for all $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_0$, $R^\wedge \in \prod_{\varphi\in\mathcal{A}_0} \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_\varphi, \mathbb{R})$. By Cartesian closedness of the category of sets:

$$\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega) \simeq \prod_{\varphi\in\mathcal{A}_0} \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_\varphi, \mathbb{R}). \tag{3.3}$$

It is also possible to see (3.3) as a diffeomorphism of diffeological spaces, see [6]. Since $R \mapsto R^\wedge$ is a bijection, we can equivalently define the full algebra $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$ starting from $u \in \prod_{\varphi\in\mathcal{A}_0} \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_\varphi, \mathbb{R})$ and considering

$$u^\vee : (\varphi, x) \in U(\Omega) \mapsto u(\varphi)(x) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This motivates the following

Definition 24. $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega) := \prod_{\varepsilon\in I^{\mathrm{e}}} \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R})$.

We can say that elements of $\mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$ are I^{e}-indexed nets (u_ε) such that $u_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R})$. The following theorem represents the unifying and simplifying capabilities of the notions of set of indices and its asymptotic relations. It underscores, also for the full Colombeau algebra, the importance of the logical structure $\forall K\, \forall\alpha\, \exists N$, $\forall K\, \forall\alpha\, \forall m$ and the use of an asymptotic relation as $\underline{\varepsilon} \to 0$.

Theorem 25. *Let $u = (u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$, then*

(i) $u^\vee \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{e}}_M(\Omega)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^{-N}\right) \ \text{ as } \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}$$

(ii) $u^\vee \in \mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^{m}\right) \ \text{ as } \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}$$

Proof. (ii): Fix $K \Subset \Omega$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. By Def. 15 of $O = O_{\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{e}}}$, the condition

$$\sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^{m}\right) \tag{3.4}$$

means

$$\exists q \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O_\varphi\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^{m}\right).$$

By (iii) of Thm. 19, this is equivalent to

$$\exists q \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u^\vee(r \odot \varphi, x)| = O\left[\left(\underline{r \odot \varphi}\right)^m\right] \ \text{as } r \to 0^+.$$

But if $\varphi \neq 0$, $\underline{r \odot \varphi} = \operatorname{diam}(\operatorname{supp}(r \odot \varphi)) = r \cdot \operatorname{diam}(\operatorname{supp}(\varphi)) =: r \cdot H_\varphi$, and the same equality holds also if $\varphi = 0$ if we set $H_\varphi := \frac{1}{r}$. Thus $O\left[\left(\underline{r \odot \varphi}\right)^m\right] = O\left(r^m \cdot H_\varphi^m\right) = O\left(r^m\right)$. Therefore, (3.4) is equivalent to

$$\exists q \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u^\vee(r \odot \varphi, x)| = O\left(r^m\right) \ \text{as } r \to 0^+$$

as claimed.

(i): Fix $K \Subset \Omega$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$. We firstly need to reformulate the condition

$$\exists N \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u^\vee(r \odot \varphi, x)| = O\left(r^{-N}\right) \ \text{as } r \to 0^+ \tag{3.5}$$

so that the term r^{-N} doesn't depend on N, which appears also in $\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_N$. We can consider

$$\exists N, q \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u^\vee(r \odot \varphi, x)| = O\left(r^{-N}\right) \ \text{as } r \to 0^+. \tag{3.6}$$

In fact, (3.5) implies (3.6) for logical reasons (the former is a particular case of the latter, the one where $q = N$). Vice versa, assuming (3.6), we have

$$\forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u^\vee(r \odot \varphi, x)| = O\left(r^{-N}\right) \ \text{as } r \to 0^+$$

for some $q, N \in \mathbb{N}$. If $q \leq N$, we get (3.5) from $\mathcal{A}_q \supseteq \mathcal{A}_N$. If $q > N$, then $r^{-q} > r^{-N}$ for $0 < r < 1$, so $y_r = O\left(r^{-N}\right)$ implies $y_r = O\left(r^{-q}\right)$ and we obtain (3.5) once again. Thus, the following part of (3.6)

$$\exists q \in \mathbb{N}\, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q : \ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u^\vee(r \odot \varphi, x)| = O\left(r^{-N}\right) \ \text{as } r \to 0^+,$$

as proved above, can be equivalently written as

$$\sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^{-N}\right) \ \text{as } \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}. \qquad \square$$

4. Big-O for uniform asymptotic relations

Frequently, the asymptotic relation

$$\sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O\left(\varepsilon^{-N}\right) \ \text{as } \varepsilon \to 0^+$$

is expressed by saying that: $\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x) = O\left(\varepsilon^{-N}\right)$ uniformly for $x \in K$. With this we mean

$$\exists H \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\, \exists \varepsilon_0 \in (0,1]\, \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]\, \forall x \in K : \ |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| \leq H \cdot \varepsilon^{-N}.$$

In this section, we want to see that this is a general possibility in every set of indices. On the one hand, this will permit a further simplification in our formulas, but on

the other hand it hides the choice of the particular seminorm $f \mapsto \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha f(x)|$ we are considering in these algebras.

Definition 26. Let $\mathbb{I} = (I, \leq, \mathcal{I})$ be a set of indices, $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and (x_ε), $(y_\varepsilon) : I \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$. Let $a \in A \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be a non empty subset of $\mathcal{I}$ such that

$$\forall A, B \in \mathcal{J}\, \exists C \in \mathcal{J} :\ C \subseteq A \cap B.$$

Then:

(i) We say that $x_\varepsilon = O^K_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$ if

$$\exists H \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\, \exists \varepsilon_0 \in A_{\leq a}\, \forall \varepsilon \in A_{\leq \varepsilon_0}\, \forall x \in K :\ |x_\varepsilon(x)| \leq H \cdot |y_\varepsilon(x)|.$$

(ii) We say that $x_\varepsilon = O^K_{\mathcal{J}}(y_\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$ if $\exists A \in \mathcal{J}\, \forall a \in A :\ x_\varepsilon = O^K_{a,A}(y_\varepsilon)$. As above, we simply write $x_\varepsilon = O^K(y_\varepsilon)$ (as $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$) if $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}$.

Theorem 27. *Under the assumptions of Def. 26, for both $O^K_{a,A}$ and $O^K_{\mathcal{J}}$ all the properties of Thm. 10 and Thm. 16 hold.*

Proof. We can prove this result repeating the proofs of Thm. 10 and Thm. 16, or noting that the order relation on $\mathbb{R}^K$ given by

$$f \leq g \quad :\Longleftrightarrow \quad \forall x \in K :\ f(x) \leq g(x)$$

inherits from the usual order relation on $\mathbb{R}$ all the properties we need. □

Corollary 28. *Let $u = (u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{P}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$, then*

(i) $u^\vee \in \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{e}}_M(\Omega)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} :\ \partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon = O^K\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^{-N}\right) \text{ as } \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}$$

(ii) $u^\vee \in \mathcal{N}^{\mathrm{e}}(\Omega)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} :\ \partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon = O^K\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^{m}\right) \text{ as } \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}$$

Applying the uniform asymptotic relation to the algebra $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ of asymptotic functions, we obtain

Corollary 29. *Let $(u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ be a net of smooth functions.*

(i) $(u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathcal{E}(\Omega)^{\mathcal{D}_0}\right)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} :\ \partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon = O^K(\underline{\varepsilon}^{-N}) \text{ as } \varepsilon \in \hat{\mathbb{I}}$$

(ii) $(u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{N}\left(\mathcal{E}(\Omega)^{\mathcal{D}_0}\right)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} :\ \partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon = O^K(\underline{\varepsilon}^{m}) \text{ as } \varepsilon \in \hat{\mathbb{I}}.$$

5. DIFFEOMORPHISM INVARIANT ALGEBRAS

We can use the notion of set of indices to simplify the definitions of the diffeomorphism invariant algebra $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$. We will see a simpler formulation, but not a unifying one. On the contrary, this reformulation underscores some conceptual differences between $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$, $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}$, $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ on the one hand and $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ on the other hand.

We start by recalling the following

Definition 30.

(i) $\mathcal{E}^C(\Omega) := \mathcal{C}^\infty(U(\Omega), \mathbb{R})$.

(ii) We say $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_q)$ if and only if $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_q)$ and

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega \, \exists B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \text{ bounded} \, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n \, \forall \varepsilon \in (0,1] \, \forall x \in K : \ \operatorname{supp}\left[\partial^\alpha \varphi(\varepsilon, x)\right] \subseteq B.$$

(iii) We say $R \in \mathcal{E}^C_M(\Omega)$ if and only if $R \in \mathcal{E}^C(\Omega)$ and

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega \, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n \, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} \, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_0) : \quad \sup_{x \in K} \left|\partial_x^\alpha R\left(\varepsilon \odot \varphi(\varepsilon, x), x\right)\right| = O\left(\varepsilon^{-N}\right).$$

(iv) We say $R \in \mathcal{N}^C(\Omega)$ if and only if $R \in \mathcal{E}^C_M(\Omega)$ and

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega \, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n \, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} \, \exists q \in \mathbb{N} \, \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_q) : \quad \sup_{x \in K} \left|\partial_x^\alpha R\left(\varepsilon \odot \varphi(\varepsilon, x), x\right)\right| = O\left(\varepsilon^{m}\right).$$

There are three main problems in defining a set of indices for $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$:

(a) Both the test functions and the representatives are evaluated at $x \in \Omega$:
- For $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$ we have terms like: $\partial_x^\alpha R(\varepsilon \odot \varphi(\varepsilon, x), x)$.
- For $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{s}}$, $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ we have terms like: $\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)$ (see Cor. 17, Thm. 25, Cor. 28, Cor. 29).

(b) In the definition of moderate representatives for $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$, test objects are taken in $\mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_0)$: compare Def. 23 and Def. 30.

(c) The third problem is tied to the dependence of $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_q)$ on $\varepsilon \in (0,1]$, and the use of the mollification

$$\varepsilon \odot \varphi(\varepsilon, x). \tag{5.1}$$

Of course, this is very different from the analogous $\varepsilon \odot \varphi$, with $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_q$, used for $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{e}}$. For example, using (5.1) we cannot say that $\operatorname{supp}(\varepsilon \odot \varphi) = \varepsilon \cdot \operatorname{supp}(\varphi)$ and so $\underline{\varepsilon \odot \varphi} = \varepsilon \cdot \underline{\varphi}$.

Problem (a) is solved considering an isomorphic version of $\mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_0)$:

Definition 31. Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$, then we say $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1], \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q))$ if and only if the following conditions are satified:

(i) $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty((0,1], \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q))$. We use the notation $\varphi = (\varphi_\varepsilon)$ for this type of maps.

(ii) $\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \exists B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ bounded $\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \forall \varepsilon \in (0,1]\, \forall x \in K :\ \operatorname{supp}[\partial^\alpha \varphi_\varepsilon(x)] \subseteq B$.

We have the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_q) \simeq \mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1], \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q))$$

in the category of diffeological spaces when both spaces are viewed as subspaces of the corresponding functional spaces $\mathcal{C}^\infty((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_q)$ and $\mathcal{C}^\infty((0,1], \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q))$ (see [6] for the definition of diffeology on $\mathcal{A}_q$).
Problem (b) is solved considering the asymptotic relation $O_{\mathcal{J}}$ generated by $\mathcal{J} = \{\mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_0)\}$. Actually, this is the first time we really need the asymptotic relation $O_{\mathcal{J}}$ with $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{I}$. This implies that we need to use $O_{\mathcal{J}}$ for the moderateness condition and $O_{\mathcal{I}}$ for the negligibility condition, i.e. we use two different asymptotic relations.

Problem (c) is solved by keeping the information of the fixed test function $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1] \times \Omega, \mathcal{A}_q)$ "in the index", i.e. by considering indices of the form $\varepsilon = (r, \varphi)$.

Definition 32.

(i) $I^{\mathrm{d}}_q(\Omega) := (0,1] \times \mathcal{C}^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}((0,1], \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_q))$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$.
(ii) $I^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega) := I^{\mathrm{d}}_0(\Omega)$
(iii) $\mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega) := \left\{ I^{\mathrm{d}}_q(\Omega) \mid q \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$
(iv) For $\varepsilon = (r, \varphi)$, $e = (s, \psi) \in I^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega)$, define $\varepsilon \leq e$ if and only if $\varphi = \psi$ and $r \leq s$
(v) $\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega) := (I^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega), \leq, \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega))$
(vi) $\forall \varepsilon = (r, \varphi) \in I^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega)\, \forall x \in \Omega :\ \mathrm{ev}_\varepsilon(x) := (r \odot \varphi_r(x), x)$. Therefore $\mathrm{ev}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega, U(\Omega))$.
(vii) If $\varepsilon = (r, \varphi) \in I^d(\Omega)$, then $\underline{\varepsilon} := r$.
(viii) If $u \in \mathcal{E}^C(\Omega)$, then $u_\varepsilon := u \circ \mathrm{ev}_\varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon \in I^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega)$. Note that $u_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$.

Theorem 33. *$\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega) = (I^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega), \leq, \mathcal{I}^{\mathrm{d}}(\Omega))$ is a set of indices.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of the definitions. □

Because of (iv) and (vii) one may call this a *trivial* set of indexes.

Theorem 34. *Let $u \in \mathcal{E}^C(\Omega)$, and $\mathcal{J} := \left\{ I^{\mathrm{d}}_0(\Omega) \right\}$, then*

(i) *$u \in \mathcal{E}^C_M(\Omega)$ if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} :\ \sup_{x \in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O_{\mathcal{J}}\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^{-N}\right) \text{ as } \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{d}}$$

(ii) *If* $u \in \mathcal{E}_M^C(\Omega)$*, then* $u \in \mathcal{N}^C(\Omega)$ *if and only if*

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} :\ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^m\right) \ \text{as } \varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{d}}$$

Proof. This is immediate from $u\left[\mathrm{ev}_{(r,\varphi)}(x)\right] = u(r \odot \varphi_r(x), x)$ and $\underline{(r,\varphi)} = r$. □

We finally remark that, similarly to the case of $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$, one can treat the algebras $\mathcal{G}^2$ and $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ of [8].

6. Application: point values characterization of generalized function

In this section we want to show that our unified point of view can effectively be used to generalize proofs which hold for the special algebra.

We assume:

(i) $\mathbb{I} = (I, \leq, \mathcal{I})$ is a set of indices. All the big-O relations in this section have to be meant as $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$.

(ii) For each $a \in A \in \mathcal{I}$ there exists a sequence $(z_k)_k$ of $A_{\leq a}$ such that $(z_k)_k \to \emptyset$ in $A_{\leq a}$. Moreover $\forall b, c \in A_{\leq a} :\ b < c$ or $c \leq b$.

(iii) $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ is a non empty subset of $\mathcal{I}$ such that $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{J}\, \exists C \in \mathcal{J} :\ C \subseteq A \cap B$.

(iv) There is a map $I \to (0,1]$, $\varepsilon \mapsto \underline{\varepsilon}$ such that

$$\exists A \in \mathcal{I}\, \forall a \in A :\ \lim_{\varepsilon \in A_{\leq a}} \underline{\varepsilon} = 0.$$

(v) Let a map $\varepsilon \mapsto \Omega_\varepsilon$ be given, where Ω_ε is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ for each $\varepsilon \in I$. Then we set $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega) := \{u : \bigcup_{\varepsilon\in I}\{\varepsilon\} \times \Omega_\varepsilon \to \mathbb{R} \mid u(\varepsilon, \cdot) \in C^\infty(\Omega_\varepsilon, \mathbb{R})\ \forall \varepsilon \in I\}$. We write u_ε instead of $u(\varepsilon, \cdot)$. We furthermore have two subsets $\mathcal{E}_M^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$ of $\mathcal{E}^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$ characterized as follows:

(a) $u \in \mathcal{E}_M^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$ iff

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} :\ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O_{\mathcal{J}}\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^{-N}\right)$$

(b) If $u \in \mathcal{E}_M^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$, then $u \in \mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$ iff

$$\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} :\ \sup_{x\in K} |u_\varepsilon(x)| = O\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^m\right).$$

For $\mathbb{I}$ we consider the cases $\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{s}}$, $\hat{\mathbb{I}}$ and $\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}$ for which Ω_ε is given by Ω, Ω and $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathrm{supp}\varphi + x \subseteq \Omega\}$, respectively. Then we have the following formulation of Thm. 1.2.3 of [8].

Theorem 35. *If* $\mathbb{I} \in \{\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{s}}, \hat{\mathbb{I}}, \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}\}$ *and* $(u_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{E}_M^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$*, then the following are equivalent:*

(i) $u \in \mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$

(ii) $\forall K \Subset \Omega\, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n\, \forall m \in \mathbb{N} :\ \sup_{x\in K} |\partial^\alpha u_\varepsilon(x)| = O\left(\underline{\varepsilon}^m\right)$ *as* $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$.

Proof. The proof is only a reformulation of Thm. 1.2.3 of [8], provided we use $\underline{\varepsilon}$ instead of ε. We only note that in one of the final steps we have

$$\partial_i u_\varepsilon(x) = \underbrace{\big(u_\varepsilon(x+\underline{\varepsilon}^{m+N}e_i) - u_\varepsilon(x)\big)}_{O(\underline{\varepsilon}^{2m+N})}\underline{\varepsilon}^{-m-N} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\partial_i^2 u_\varepsilon(x_\theta)\,\underline{\varepsilon}^{m+N}}_{O(\underline{\varepsilon}^{-N})}$$

and these two big-O are both of the same type $O_{\mathcal{I}}$ if $\mathbb{I} \in \{\mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{s}}, \hat{\mathbb{I}}, \mathbb{I}^{\mathrm{e}}\}$. On the contrary, in the case of the diffeomorphism invariant algebras $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{d}}$, $\mathcal{G}^2$ the first big-O would be $O_{\mathcal{I}}$, whereas the second one would be $O_{\mathcal{J}}$, so the proof cannot be trivially generalized. □

We can now define

Definition 36.

(i) $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega) := \mathcal{E}^{\mathbb{I}}_M(\Omega)/\mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$

(ii) $\Omega^{\mathbb{I}}_M := \big\{(x_\varepsilon) \in \Omega^I \mid \exists N \in \mathbb{N} :\ x_\varepsilon = O_{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{\varepsilon}^{-N})\big\}$

(iii) $(x_\varepsilon) \sim_{\mathbb{I}} (y_\varepsilon)$ iff $\forall m \in \mathbb{N} :\ x_\varepsilon - y_\varepsilon = O(\underline{\varepsilon}^m)$, where (x_ε), $(y_\varepsilon) \in \Omega^{\mathbb{I}}_M$

(iv) $\widetilde{\Omega}^{\mathbb{I}} := \Omega^{\mathbb{I}}_M/\sim_{\mathbb{I}}$

(v) If $\mathcal{P}(\varepsilon)$ is a property of $\varepsilon \in I$, then we write

$$\forall^{\mathbb{I}}\varepsilon :\ \mathcal{P}(\varepsilon)$$

iff $\exists A \in \mathcal{I}\,\forall a \in A\,\exists \varepsilon_0 \le a\,\forall \varepsilon \in A_{\le \varepsilon_0} :\ \mathcal{P}(\varepsilon)$, and we read it saying "for $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{I}$ sufficiently small $\mathcal{P}(\varepsilon)$ holds".

(vi) $[x_\varepsilon] \in \widetilde{\Omega}^{\mathbb{I}}_c$ iff $[x_\varepsilon] \in \widetilde{\Omega}^{\mathbb{I}}$ and $\exists K \Subset \Omega\,\forall^{\mathbb{I}}\varepsilon :\ x_\varepsilon \in K$

(vii) If $u = [u_\varepsilon] \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$ and $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}^{\mathbb{I}}_c$, then $u(x) := [u_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon)]$.

The following theorem is a simple generalization of Prop. 1.2.45 and Thm. 1.2.46 of [8] by applying assumption (ii), Lem. 13 and Thm. 14:

Theorem 37. *Let $u \in \mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$, then:*

(i) If $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}^{\mathbb{I}}_c$, then $u(x)$ is a well-defined element of $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathbb{I}}$.

(ii) $u = 0$ in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathbb{I}}(\Omega)$ iff $u(x) = 0$ in $\widetilde{\mathbb{R}}^{\mathbb{I}}$ for all $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}^{\mathbb{I}}_c$.

7. Conclusions

The notions we introduced in this article are helpful for a unified presentation of Colombeau algebras and highlight the conceptual analogies between several Colombeau algebras. There are three ways to work with the notions we introduced in this article. The first one is to work in a generic set of indices. The second one is to work in the Colombeau algebra we are interested in, but using the particular set of indices that simplifies its definition. The third one has been presented in section 6: we assume those properties that hold in all the cases we are interested in. In our opinion, the first one is the hardest because it introduces a great level of

abstraction. Of course, the results obtained using this abstract method are more general because they apply to several different Colombeau type algebras. At the same time, frequently these results are almost trivial generalizations of analogous results already known for the special algebra.

References

[1] Adamek, J., Herrlich, H., Strecker, G., *Abstract and Concrete Categories*. John Wiley and Sons, 1990.

[2] Bourbaki, N., *Fonctions d'une variable reelle*, Paris, Hermann, 1976.

[3] Colombeau, J.F., *New generalized functions and multiplication of distributions*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.

[4] Colombeau, J.F., *Elementary introduction to new generalized functions*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985.

[5] Colombeau, J.F., *Multiplication of distributions - A tool in mathematics, numerical engineering and theoretical Physics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1992.

[6] Giordano P., Wu E., *Categorical frameworks for generalized functions*. To appear in Arabian Journal of Mathematics, 2014.

[7] Goldblatt, R., *Lectures on the Hyperreals. An Introduction to Nonstandard Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York, 1998.

[8] Grosser, M., Kunzinger, M., Oberguggenberger, M., Steinbauer, R., *Geometric theory of generalized functions*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2001.

[9] Nigsch, E., *Point value characterizations and related results in the full Colombeau algebras, $\mathcal{G}^e(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{G}^d(\Omega)$*, Mathematische Nachrichten, Volume 286, Issue 10, pp. 1007–1021, 2013.

[10] Oberguggenberger, M. *Multiplication of Distributions and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*. Vol. 259. Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics. Harlow, U.K.: Longman, 1992.

[11] Todorov, T.D., Vernaeve, H., Full algebra of generalized functions and non-standard asymptotic analysis. *Log. Anal.* **1** (2008), 205-234.

Faculty of Mathematics, University of Vienna, Austria, Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Wien, Austria

E-mail address: paolo.giordano@univie.ac.at, eduard.nigsch@univie.ac.at